

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,549	GRAHAM, ROBERT G.	

All Participants:

(1) N. Bhat. (3) _____.

(2) R. McKellar. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 February 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

See Continuation Sheet

Claims discussed:

1 only

Prior art documents discussed:

Cordell et al. in combination with Williams et al.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of rejections discussed: 112, 2nd paragraph rejection as well as obviousness rejection over cited prior art .

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Although prior art doesn't teach individually controlled burn areas, the claim as drafted does not teach how the modular design itself is individually controlled. The examiner suggested and was agreed to by applicant to include the limitations of claim 7 into claim 1 which teaches exactly how each modular cell is individually controlled to overcome the obviousness rejection as well as the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection. .